

Office of the Child Advocate  
Juvenile Justice Policy and Data Board  
Data Subcommittee Meeting Minutes  
Thursday February 10, 2022  
10:30am-12:00pm  
**Meeting held virtually**

**Subcommittee Members or Designees Present:**

- Kim Occhiuti (DCF)
- Nancy Brody (DCF)
- David Chandler (DYS)
- Lydia Todd (CLM)
- Matthew Broderick (DMH)
- Rachel Wallack (Juvenile Court)
- Sana Fadel (CfJJ)
- Dana Bernson (DPH)
- Dulcinea Goncalves (CPCS)

**OCA Staff:**

- Melissa Threadgill (OCA)
- Kristine Polizzano (OCA)
- Janice Neiman (OCA)
- Morgan Byrnes (OCA)

**Other Attendees:**

- Patricia Bergin (EOPSS)
- Kristina Sladek (Probation)
- Noor Toraif (DYS)
- Kathleen Bitetti (SAO)
- Meg Danisewich (DYS)
- Michael Glennon (SCDAO)
- Jenyka Spitz – Gassnola (DYS)
- Other members of the public

**Meeting Commenced: 10:05AM**

**Welcome and Introductions:**

Ms. Polizzano welcomed the attendees to the Data subcommittee meeting and welcomed all attending to introduce themselves. Members and attendees introduced themselves. Ms. Polizzano thanked the committee members for their diligent work and explained that the group would be reviewing and offering edits to the draft data section of the JJPAD Board FY21 Annual Report after reviewing the December meeting minutes.

**Review and Approval of the December Meeting Minutes:**

Ms. Polizzano asked if anyone had any questions or feedback regarding the December 9, 2021, meeting minutes. The group did not offer any feedback or objections. Kim Occhiuti, Nancy Brody, David Chandler, Lydia Todd, Sana Fadel and Dana Bernson all voted in the affirmative. Rachel Wallack abstained.

The December minutes were approved.

### **Review the draft data section of the JJPAD Board FY21 Annual Report**

Ms. Polizzano explained the rest of the meeting is devoted to reviewing the Data section of the 2021 JJPAD Annual Report. She explained rather than go through section by section, she would instead present the edits suggested by members of the committee. Ms. Polizzano began presenting the edits via PowerPoint.

Ms. Polizzano began by highlighting a discrepancy between the way EOPSS reports their arrest data compared to the way the Trial Courts report their arrest data. She explained that the OCA worked with EOPSS and the Trial Courts to try and understand these discrepancies, ultimately finding that data limitations of the federal database police departments use is the likely source of the discrepancy. Ms. Polizzano welcomed concerns or questions from the group. A member asked if the data from EOPSS is undercounted. Ms. Polizzano confirmed that yes, it is likely an undercount.

Ms. Polizzano moved on to the next edit, explaining that clarifying language and a footnote was added to explain that the 2018 Criminal Justice Reform Bill was having its intended effect. Ms. Polizzano welcomed feedback from the group. A member noted that the statute in question is an act rather than a bill and to note that. Ms. Polizzano noted this suggestion and continued.

Ms. Polizzano presented various language changes suggested by members of the committee, welcoming feedback as she went. No feedback was offered.

Ms. Polizzano highlighted a sentence that the Juvenile Court Clinic may conduct evaluations in youthful offender cases and asked the group if it considered the sentence to be relevant or if it should be cut. Members discussed the logistics of referrals to court clinics and confusion on data reported. The discussion concluded with all members agreeing the sentence should be omitted from the report.

The next point of discussion was an edit that added language around how a case gets resolved as a CWO. A member asked if it was worth including language around the outcome of a CWO and explaining that, currently, we do not have the data. Ms. Polizzano noted that edit, allowing other members to oppose. No members opposed and the edit was made.

Ms. Polizzano continued presenting the final edits suggested in Part I of the report and opened the group up to general discussion before moving on to Part II.

A member asked if the total presented in the table on pg.26 of the report included CWOs. Ms. Polizzano clarified that yes, CWOs are included in that total, stating that an edit could be made to make that clearer.

A member noted that the racial and ethnic disparities grow as the total amount of youth in the system decrease, stating that the data suggests that more white youth are diverted in comparison to youth of color. Ms. Threadgill noted that the disparities worsen after the CJRB but have gotten better.

Ms. Polizzano began presenting the edits in Part II. The first edit discussed involved the data availability of youth under 12 in the Juvenile Court. The group discussed how the CJRB raised the lower age of delinquency jurisdiction from 7 to 12, and therefore, the Courts no longer report that data. However, the group discussed that there are instances when you can be arrested or summoned, and officials do not know the youth is under the age of 12 until their case is processed by the Clerk Magistrate. At the Clerk Magistrate hearing, applications for complaint for youth under the age of 12 should be dismissed.

Ms. Threadgill suggested adding language to both clarify that the court no longer has that jurisdiction and to acknowledge that youth under the age of 12 may still come to the Trial Courts by law enforcement.

Ms. Polizzano moved on and presented the following sentence that was added to the report:

In particular, district attorneys are elected officials and have wide latitude to set their own priorities and policies regarding the use of the powers of their office.

Members discussed this language, with some noting that variations by county are not just district attorney driven, but rather they are products of decision makers at all levels. The group discussed the benefits and potential pitfalls to listing every juvenile justice official who could set their own priorities and practices. A member suggested that rather than add additional language the sentence in question could be cut. The group agreed and Ms. Polizzano noted the decision.

Ms. Polizzano opened the group up to general discussion. The group discussed the challenges and potential quality concerns with reporting crossover youth data at this time, and Ms. Threadgill suggested a follow-up discussion with DCF and DYS. No other members wished to be involved in that follow-up discussion.

Ms. Polizzano welcomed members to add any more edits to section two. No further edits were suggested. She told the group that the OCA would work to incorporate the groups' edits from today and send a final draft to the Board for review before their March 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting.

### **Concluding remarks:**

Ms. Threadgill and Ms. Polizzano thanked the group for their work in editing this document and for the data submissions. Ms. Threadgill wished everyone well and adjourned the meeting.

**Adjournment:** 11:44AM